

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 27, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 27, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 14-18, 20-23 and 26-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 14-18, 20-23 and 26-30 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 6, 11, 17, 21 and 26-28 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 21-23, 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the Examiner asserts that these claims are not directed to statutory subject matter. Claim 21 is amended with this response to recite a "processor," and "a memory containing an executable component, which when executed by the processor, is configured to receive a query..." Applicants submit that, as amended, claim 21 is limited to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Furthermore, dependent claims 22-23 and 26-27 depend from claim 21. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw this objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-11, 14-18, 20-23, 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, *Goiffon et al.* (US 6,453,312 B1), hereinafter "*Goiffon*". Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9

USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Goiffon* does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim”. For example, *Goiffon* does not disclose a “method for context-sensitive searching of fields of a data repository using multiple levels of term expansion” that includes a step of “obtaining one or more parameters associated with the base search term, wherein the one or more parameters associated with the base search term,” in particular where the one or more parameters include “at least one of a credential associated with the user, a role associated with the user, and a current state of a computing environment in which the query is to be executed,” as recited by claim 1. Similarly, *Goiffon* fails to disclose a method that includes “obtaining, based at least in part on the user-specified level of expansion and the at least one credential associated with the user, role associated with the user, or current state of a computing environment in which the query is to be executed, one or more expanded search terms,” as recited by claim 1. Claims 6, 11, 17, 21, and 28 each recite a similar limitation.

Goiffon discloses a method allowing a user to control the development of a concept-based natural language search query by controlling the manner in which a hierarchical concept tree is structured and traversed. *Goiffon*, 1:18-25. In other words, *Goiffon* discloses a system where users can expand a word-search with additional related terms selected from a hierarchy. One of the passages cited by the Examiner is illustrative:

FIG. 4 is an exemplary screen provided by Search String Wizard (SSW) 121 to users to obtain the search string and other optional parameters required to initiate development of a search query. The user provides the initial search string in Box 400. In this example, assume the user provides the term "Bugs". The user further selects the levels of hierarchy within the hierarchical concept tree in one or more Application Domains that will be utilized to develop the search. This is accomplished by specifying whether parent, sibling, or child concepts will be included for any located concepts. These parameters are specified in Boxes 402, 404, and 406, respectively. If parent and/or child concepts are to be included, the number of levels of hierarchy to be traversed during the search development may be specified in Boxes 408 and 410. A default value of "one" is assumed if no value is provided.

Goiffon, 14:45-59. While *Goiffon* does disclose that a search may be expanded based on additional terms selected by a user from the three hierarchy (e.g., the “parent” child” or “sibling” concepts), *Goiffon* does not disclose a method that includes obtaining one or more expanded search terms, based on at least in part on a credential associated with the user, a role associated with the user, or current a state of a computing environment in which the query is to be executed. Quite simply, these factors are simply irrelevant for the technique of developing a search query by traversing a tree structure disclosed in *Goiffon*. Accordingly, therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 6, 11, 17, 21 and 28 are allowable and respectfully request allowance of these claims.

Additionally, claims 2-4, 7, 9-10, 14-16, 18, 20, 22-23, 26-27, and 29-30 each depend from one of claims 1, 6, 11, 17, 21 or 28. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable and respectfully request allowance of the same.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)